



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The constitutional argument here outlined will sufficiently illustrate the author's methods of interpretation. Throughout the work he treats even the most casual expressions of political opinion in the same strictly analytical manner. The danger of this method, from the historical point of view, lies in the fact that men are not actually aware of all possible logical implications of the language they employ ; and that in the interpretation of any body of opinion or discussion almost any result desired may be obtained by employing literal implications which may, however, either not have been present at all in clear consciousness or may have held a subsidiary and incidental position. We all know how easy it would be to construct entirely opposite theories from the writings of Hobbes or Rousseau by placing emphasis successively upon various possible lateral inferences. In such cases the only refuge is to compare a theory with the actual life out of which it has grown and of which it is a representative expression. This will show where the main emphasis must be placed in the historical interpretation of any development of political theory. And when we apply this test to the author's work, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that while he has furnished a notable legal argument and a highly valuable analysis of an important part of American political thought, he has somewhat misplaced the emphasis in his interpretation of history and that he views the thought of the past rather too much from the point of our present needs of constitutional development.

PAUL S. REINSCH.

The History of South Carolina in the Revolution, 1780-1783. Volume IV. By EDWARD MCCRADY, LL.D. (New York: The Macmillan Company. 1902. Pp. 787.)

WITH this volume General McCrady brings to a conclusion his history of South Carolina during the periods of proprietary and royal government and of the Revolution. As the work has progressed the author's style has grown perceptibly freer and stronger, until in the final volume it flows onward in an ample stream. As a general political and military history of South Carolina during the first century and a quarter of its existence, this work must always rank as a standard authority. It is true that certain well-known books have been very fully and freely used as materials in its composition ; but these books contained the best that was accessible on the periods to which they related. It is also apparent that in the preparation of the volume on the period of royal government not all accessible manuscript sources were searched for information or, if they were searched, the material was not all utilized.

To students of the social and economic structure of society, to those who are interested in determining the place which South Carolina held in the British-American colonial system the work will be useful as a storehouse of material, and not because of any especially valuable opinions or views which it contains. The strictness with which the author has adhered to the annalistic form and to political and military history gives

a certain narrowness to the work. We are furnished with no picture of the social disintegration which accompanied the war of the Revolution throughout the state, though we could perhaps construct it from the details of military raids which fill nearly two volumes. But, though the plan of the author may have been somewhat narrow, he has done well what he undertook to do. The work exhibits large knowledge of the subject, united with honest and sound judgment throughout. There is evidence of abundant sectional pride in the mind of the author, but the record of South Carolina, especially in the Revolution, to a large degree justifies that. Its existence, together with General McCrady's view of the isolation of South Carolina, and the emphasis which he lays upon it, makes this one of the most intensely state histories which we have.

As was to be expected, the author devotes his last volume on the Revolution mainly to the history of the doings of the partizan bands in South Carolina and to their relations with the small regular army which was sent thither under Greene. In the studies of the famous campaign of 1781 by earlier writers Greene has been the central figure. Inasmuch as the most careful studies of that campaign have hitherto been written by biographers and admirers of Greene, that was a natural result. Both Johnson and G. W. Greene—the work of the latter, by the way, McCrady does not mention—though able writers, frankly expressed their admiration for the Rhode Island general. But in the pages of McCrady, though Greene occupies a prominent position, his is not the place of chief honor. The central place is occupied by a group, of which the most prominent figures are those of Sumter, Marion, and Pickens. They are surrounded by a number of less famous associates among the partizan leaders of the section. Greene, and with him Major Henry Lee, is the object of much criticism, though also of not a little moderate praise. Morgan, too, comes in for less praise and more criticism than has been usual in histories of the period.

According to the view of General McCrady, the partizan bands, though constantly forming and dissolving, won the decisive successes in South Carolina. So far at least as that state was concerned, the feeling of superiority among the regulars and their officers was unjustified. Greene, moreover, conceived an unwarranted prejudice against Sumter and entered almost upon an intrigue with Lee to bring about Sumter's retirement. Greene also failed to appreciate the conditions which existed in the country which he had come to defend. He had the unfortunate habit of writing long and not very tactful letters. While praising commanders to their face, he disparaged them in letters to third parties. His heart was not in the task, and after the retreat of Cornwallis toward Virginia Greene desired to follow him. Greene was defeated in every encounter in the south in which he was engaged, and he had the habit of attributing his ill success to others than himself. As the battle of Guilford Court-House and the operations which immediately preceded it do not fall within the compass of his subject, the author does not find any brilliant manœuvring of which Greene should receive the credit. The

relations which at the close of the war developed between Greene and the civil authorities of South Carolina were most unfortunate and trying for the general.

The author admits that Sumter and his associates were perhaps unduly sensitive. But the great difficulties under which their work was done — with no government to raise troops for them and furnish them with supplies — and the important results which they achieved entitled them to strong feelings of pride. General McCrady's conclusions are based on the letters of Greene, on the correspondence of Sumter, which was published in the *Charleston Year Book* of 1899, but especially on the study of the war map of South Carolina during the Revolution. To the 26 engagements which had been fought by the partizans, or state troops, in 1780 were added 62 engagements in 1781, 45 of which were fought without the aid of the Continentals. By this activity not only were the Tories held in check, but the communications of the British were cut off, serious losses were inflicted upon them, and they were at last forced back to Charleston. Though the author does not deny that the presence of the Continental army was necessary to give consistency to the American system of defense, he claims that the heavier part of the work was done by the partizans. The British were destroyed by slow attrition, the blows being mainly inflicted by the local forces.

The last volume of the work is certainly the most original of the four. The criticism of earlier views which it contains is healthy and valuable. It effectually rehabilitates Sumter and brings him out much more clearly into the light of history. It administers a check to hero-worship by presenting a remarkable picture of the sacrifices which an entire people will make in defense of their homes. But, since history affords comparatively few such spectacles, the judgment of British officers in the earlier colonial period and of Washington during the French War and the Revolution concerning the comparative value of militia and regulars will not be seriously modified.

HERBERT L. OSGOOD.

The Writings of James Madison. Edited by GAILLARD HUNT. Volume III. 1787. The Journal of the Constitutional Convention, I. (New York and London : G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1902. Pp. xxi, 471.)

MR. HUNT's third volume comprises Madison's notes of the debates in the Philadelphia Convention through July 18 ; the fourth will present the remainder, with an index to the two, which are evidently intended to be issued separately, as a work independent of the rest of the series. In one sense, these notes do not form a necessary part of Madison's writings. But on the whole we have nothing else from his pen so important as this record of what he and others said in that memorable gathering, and there is a distinct need of a new edition. Gilpin's is not now easy to procure ; the fifth volume of Elliot, unless one picks up an early issue, is obtainable only in shabby print from worn plates ; the text presented in the